



Milam: Mr. Nyland, I know it is ridiculous to ask you to summarize this - how many years of thinking? Fifty - sixty of years of thinking of ideas and thought - N. Kind of difficult to say, you know - (laughter)

M. In a few minutes, but, I think what might be helpful to us is by giving us some of your thoughts on current events and current trends, ideas and experimentation with the mind. Now before we began this program, you were mentioning some of your thoughts about Dr. Timothy Leary - about what is called the psychedelic movement, the experiments with LSD. Do you think the use of LSD or similar drugs is good or vital or important way to change the workings of the mind to improve it?

N. I think it's important. I think that the mind of course, can be changed because it is affected by the drug. But - I think there are also many dangers involved in it. I think it's a very good chemical to do some experimentation with and that it has a definite affect on the mind, there's no doubt about it, but it has to be a little bit more controlled than it is at the present time, so it doesn't exclude scientific investigation but I think that to simply let it loose and let everybody use it, I think it is much too dangerous.

M. Would you yourself experiment with it?

N. No.

M. Why not?

N. Because I don't need it.

M. Does one have to need it?

N. No. I mean - what is the idea? They call it an enlarging of the consciousness and I think there are different ways of enlarging so-called - that is making the consciousness function in a different way.

M. Well, give me an example of other ways to do that.

N. By developing it.

M. How does one develop it?

N. By introducing certain elements which it hasn't got at the present time. If one can, for instance, if consciousness at the present time is subjective

ingredient of a human being - if it could function differently and function independently of any of the other, what we call influences, if it could function in such a way that it would actually record information, particularly about oneself, in an impartial manner it would ( ) differently than it does now.

M. Your idea is to make the mind a computer then.

N. Well, the idea would be not the computer necessarily, then only that it could function as a computer provided that there is something else that would be able to guide it. So that it's not the mind on its own, it's the mind becoming an instrument in the service of something else, perhaps a higher form of being.

M. -But I say in the way you speak of it makes it into an electronic mechanism. You're idealizing the mechanistic aspects of the mind.

N. That's right. I think it should be purer than it is at the present time because it is now subject to interpretation on the part of one's personality.

M. Is your mind subject to those problems?

N. Oh. I think everybody's mind is. Surely.

M. But as you continue to grow do you continue to try to change this yourself?

N. Well, I think it can be changed. Let's say it that way. That naturally would have to be based on an experience of one's own. And I think it is possible for other people to change it. To make it vibrate in a different rate of vibrations.

M. Now. Explain that. --Let's come at it another way. Let's assume that maybe someone listening to this program is at the age of twenty-one or twenty-two, maybe they've just gotten <sup>on</sup> out of college, maybe they're -seeking some way, they've found a bit of discontent with the life as it's occurred to them now. They've grown up in a standard American family with fairly standard American ideas. Have you got any method - or any suggestions for how this person could get out of their traps - if they feel that they are-

N. -I think the greatest difficulty is that we continue to fill the mind with <sup>and</sup> a great many data <sub>than</sub> knowledge which is not really used enough in order to make out of knowledge, understanding. I think understanding is actually is gained in any event by means of putting whatever knowledge one has into practice.

And I think if one can collect data about oneself which are more truthful and not interpreted by whatever one feels about it or thinks about it - it would have a purer basis to start from and make it more absolute, and perhaps then more truthful. I think that's important first.

M. I think I suffer from the trouble of not really understanding what you're trying to say because you speak - you don't - you choose not to speak - ah, I want to use the word '<sup>paradigm</sup> ~~periodiae~~' or 'epigrams', or rather you want to speak in a - very vague philosophical

N. No, the way we will talk about it is that there is a possibility that the mind as it is functioning at the present time - we'll call it 'subjective' because it belongs to the personality. If there were a possibility for the mind to function in a different way that it could look impartially at that what it observes, then I think it has a function <sup>which</sup> ~~that~~ is different from the present one, and in that particular state it is freer from interpretation as a result of that what I like or dislike or what I would change or the criticism that I might have about the things I observe, particularly about myself, and that it is necessary to introduce an element of impartiality.

M. Do you <sup>know</sup> of any man in the history of the earth who's ever been truly impartial?

N. No. I think it would be very difficult to judge about it from the outside, you know. Because you don't know what the man actually experienced. I think there are moments for every person in which he is more impartial than at other times.

M. Is there any writer or thinker who has been, in their writing say, that were truly impartial?

N. I think anyone who is trying to find out about the real value of life gradually discovers certain facts which for him <sup>become</sup> incontrovertable and when for him <sup>being</sup> they have an absolute value they come closer to <sup>being</sup> objective. I think, theoretically speaking, that a fact that is objective should be acceptable to everybody without argument.

M. I must say the words you speak seem to me to be objective, but that is once

again, because you choose not to speak from live examples, you choose to speak only with words.

N. I don't think one can really speak in any other way than using words that convey a concept, and that the real way of a person that experiences or is in a state in which he could become or be self-conscious will show this in the way he manifests.

M. Alright, let's start from another direction for a moment and see if this will help. Is there any prophet that you have known of in the history of man's thinking that you really, to you yourself, idolize? Mahatma Gandhi, Jesus Christ...

N. Oh, I think, there are several people who have certain things to say which, of course, appeals to one and you consider it of more value than other statements. It's not a question of comparing it to some extent because I think that sometimes a person's interpretation may be very variable, not only for the person, but also for someone else who reads about it. So I'm not excluding that kind of knowledge which, I think, is valuable for a man to live on earth or in this world, I think he should be conversant with what different people have said, then try to form a judgment for himself that appeals to him in his own life. I think the problem is not so much the study of other people but to see whatever that kind of a study will give to oneself for one's own development.

M. Have you yourself studied at great length the works of Christ?

N. Oh, yes. Of course I'm interested in a variety of different...

M. Would you call yourself a Christian?

N. Oh, yes.

M. You would.

N. Oh, yes.

M. Ah, do you see contradictions between the teachings of Christ and the teachings of ~~Buddha~~?

N. Yes.

M. You do?

N. I think there are...

M. Ah, is there any way how you can evaluate how someone...

*all*

N. Yeh, it- it's *all* together a different question. People who live under the influences of Buddha live~~s~~ most in the country where Buddha has lived, and their conditions are different from what we have to face here. I think it's very difficult to be a Christian, let's say, in India, or to be a Buddhist here in America.

M. The people who are - are going out and, say~~ing~~, converting the natives don't think it difficult for a Christian to <sup>be in</sup> Japan or in India.

N. No, and I...

M. And from the works they've done they seem to be fairly successful.

N. Well, I don't know how successful they are.

M. Do you believe in conversion to Christianity? Do you think this is a valid way of - of ...

N. No, I wouldn't say, off hand, that I believe a person should become a Christian. If that is what you mean.

M. No. But I mean for instance - ah, the work of the missionaries, don't you think it's a valid and ...

N. No, I think there is an essential value in each religion and it is a question to find out what is this essential value, and then if that appeals to a particular person, if he is brought up in a surrounding in which he can find that essential value in Christianity or Buddhism or Mohammedanism or whatever he has been brought up with. I think that then reaches, for him what is naturally a conduct of his life.

M. If I'm to react to this few minutes that we have spoken together I would say that you yourself have no beliefs because what you have said in this time is that every man should judge for himself.

N. The question is, what do you call a belief? The question is that if he has a religion it has to be apparent in his life. The way he lives if he has principle. If he has character. If he is able to live in accordance with, let's say, the Golden Rule, but if you want to apply the Ten Commandments <sup>to</sup> of the life of a Christian I think it is a very difficult scientific thing to find someone who

is living up to those commandments.

N. Well, it's interpretation, isn't it. I mean, do you believe that people that are fighting to preserve this country in Vietnam now, say, are living up to the ten commandments?

N. No.

M. You don't!

N. Do you?

M. Now, wait a minute ( laughter) you -

N. No. I don't think they care, and I don't think anyone cares.

M/ Are you saying, I mean - under what - do you think by their -

N. You see, you must not mix up these ideas that a person who happens to be in Vietnam - are they there to bring Christianity?

M. No. I think not. I think what they're doing is protecting their country.

N. Yah, God.

M. and I'm asking you whether on the, say, the commandment 'thou shalt not kill', are they violating that by what they are doing in Vietnam?

N. You're mixing up something now that is either political or sociological or a necessity as far as differences of racial quality or people interfering with the system of government or the protection of all kinds of investments, that you have to separate that completely from the way a person has to live in his ordinary life. I think that a person has a private life which is probably his religion, and a personal life in relation to those who are quite close to him, and a professional life in which he earns a little money. Now in connection with there happens to be a part of a sociological outfit, a government or country, and with that he also has obligations. So now, if the, if the law of the country requires him that he has to fight, he has a very hard time where there's a conscience that he feels he doesn't want to kill.

M. Have you ever lived in a totalitarian country yourself?

N. No.

M. You haven't. Ah - I mean - what, what - you're just saying - what in effect

you are doing is creating a system of values which is saying a man is what he believes.

N. No, he has to have a personal judgment about what he should do. It's not so much of the believing as the actual doing of it.

M. Then you can do anything just as long as you do - as your actions are consistent with your belief.

N. That's right. It has to be. It has to be - but when one says, a good man - but you see I don't think that's the ultimate purpose of man. I think he should live on earth in the best way he possibly can and probably has to adapt himself to the conditions under which he has to live. But I think another purpose for man, if it actually has to fulfill something, that I believe is an obligation to him, is that he should develop.

M. Would you call yourself an existentialist?

N. Oh, I think so. I think there all kind of names one could apply. I don't think it matters very much because there all kinds of shades, even among existentialists.

M. Mm-hum.

N. So where I would I be?

M: I'm trying to find out - I'm trying to find out.

N. I don't think you can pin it down.

M. Alright, take some of the teachings of existentialism. For instance of the eternal, of death or dying. Do you accept that? You called yourself a Christian.

N. I have to accept death, of course, because everybody dies. The question is: Is there a spirit in man that continues to live?

M. Do you believe there is?

N. Oh, yes. I don't think there's any doubt. As far as <sup>I'm</sup> concerned. But it doesn't mean I want to prove <sup>it</sup> to someone. You see, I can have an idea that things exist which for me has value; it doesn't mean they might have value for someone else. Sometimes I have wished that they would have that same kind of a value; then, you might say, we can get along. But I cannot argue about it. At most I can explain what is satisfactory to me, but I think each person should be left,

within certain reasons, of course, in a reasonable kind of a conduct that he has to do whatever his conscience teaches him or tells him to do.

M. You believe that when you die that some part of your spirit will remain.

N. Oh, yes.

M. In what form?

N. Spiritual. Because the spirit.

M. Where here? Can we think of it as being here? In this world?

N. Oh, yes. Because the limitations at the present time are limited by his body.

M. Do you believe in Heaven and Hell?

N. No, not in that sense.

M. Do you believe in a spiritual existence after death?

N. I believe in a continuation after death for the possibility for man to free himself from bondage, and I think that when he dies he is still bound, but a little less than he is on earth.

M. Do you believe that it is possible to communicate with these spirits?

N. Yes, I think it has been proven time and time again.

M. Have you done so?

N. No.

M. Have you tried?

N. No.

M. Why not?

N. Because I have not had that kind of an interest.

M. But if you wanted to be sure. Don't you want to be sure that spirits exist after you die?

N. I think that as far as my personal experience is concerned, I believe, exist because I have had as experience or several experiences in which I can explain only on the basis of you might call it guidance, or being in contact.

M. Would you describe one of those experiences?

N. No. Simply - let's say, if I go to a clairvoyant or medium and there are certain things that are being told to me by a person the medium doesn't know

but nevertheless are facts in my life then, of course, I would have belief in them.

M. Has this happened to you?

N. Oh, yes.

M. It has happened!

N. Sure, because I'm interested.

M. So you have gone to a clairvoyant.

N. Oh, yes, that I have. I thought you meant that I myself had been in contact with the spiritual world.

M. No. But you were in contact with a medium with the spiritual world?

N. Oh, yes. Sure.

M. Many times? several times? One time?

N. No, at times.

M. At times. And this is enough to convince you.

N. For me it is enough. When I get confirmation that it happens to other people also it naturally strengthens my own belief. I think there is a tremendous amount of literature on it and verified sufficiently that I wouldn't doubt it any more.

M. Well, it's hard to believe even with the works of Dr. <sup>Rhine</sup> ~~Ryan~~ that there is that much confirmation.

N. Oh yes, there are many more people, not only ~~Rhine~~ <sup>Rhine</sup>.

M. Of course, and there are many charlatans in the world of spiritualism.

N. Sure, there is everywhere. All kinds of shades among people. You think that all scientists are honest? Of course not.

M. I ask if you had ever been in a totalitarian country because I wanted to get some of your ideas of the philosophy of government. Ah, you - from what you said earlier you believe that one should do - essentially what you said was that you believe one should do just what they <sup>believe</sup> they should do.

N. Within reason. If I live in a country where there are certain laws, I become subject to the laws. If I don't like them I could go to another country, or try

to find a country which I would like better, but as long as I'm here and I belong to this country and I'm a citizen, naturally I'm subject to whatever laws there are. It doesn't mean that I have to like them, but I have to stay within them.

M. It seems that your philosophy - if I can begin <sup>to</sup> try to put some stamp on it - is one of passive acceptance of everything.

N. But why would you want to put your stamp on it? Why do you want to classify a person?

M. Ah, I'm - wait, I'm asking the questions.

N. I mean there is no particular reason to put a stamp on it. Why not leave a person on his own and at liberty to live in accordance with whatever he had as a conscience or ( ) his character?

M. Well, let's come at it another way. I'm trying to understand you because you are a person who has a reputation as a spokesman for a certain philosophy, and you have a fair number of admirers to the point where they form groups in certain cities to hear you speak and I'm trying to understand - ah - what they - why they do this - I'm trying to understand from knowing you why they do this.

M. I think several people have certain problems and they would like to have a solution to them, and whenever they can listen to someone who can give them a little bit more clarity about their own problems, I think it would be a reason for them to listen and to see that if what is being said has further value for them to be utilized in their own life. You see, it is exactly the same as if I read a book and I find something in it that I can use if I want to know how to do this and that and so-forth, and I get a technical book and I can acquire a dexterity. I think to a certain extent one goes to a psychologist and he tells me what my past was and what kind of a complex that I have, why then <sup>I</sup> will be able perhaps to do a little bit more or I can at least understand better - myself.

M. Well, you've said it - the essential philosophy of the mid-twentieth century in America is really not religious or - ah - sociological even - it's psychological...

N. No, it may be true...

(Both speak at the same time )

M. - but this seems to be where most of our problems lie.

N. But it has to be deepened. You know it has...

M. What has to be deepened?

N. For oneself. This kind of a philosophy. Because the question is, are you alone in this world together with a lot of other people, or do you accept that there are other forces outside of this earth? And then you run into higher ethics or certainty in some form of religion, particularly when you assume there are forms of being which you have to acknowledge and sometimes respect and sometimes admire, and sometimes you can pray to. This is what is called the deepening because that belongs to an inner life of the man.

M. Well, I'm saying that the deepening process comes about, commonly in this period of time for an intellectual person in this country, by going and being psychoanalyzed. Or going through psycho-therapy.

N. Well, there are a lot of people that don't want to be psychoanalyzed.

M. They're afraid, of course.

N. Of course. Or they go to their minister.

M. That's their weakness, right?

N. I don't know that it's a weakness. You go to a person that can help you.

M. We know - I mean the facts are, for instance, in non-directive psycho-therapy, the results are staggering. People who seem to have insoluble problems are helped in ninety percent of the cases. Given this, and you asked for this clarity in facts, given this, should we not say that non-directive therapy is the religion of the mid-twentieth century America.

N. It's good - I don't object to that kind of a definition if that is what you understand by religion. When a person is helped I think it involves much more as a religion, but if it is psychoanalysis, then I'm helped the same way as I go to a Doctor when I'm sick physically-if he helps him psychologically that's fine, but it does not mean that it becomes a religion. People like...

M. It solves all their problems like religion did in the nineth or eighteenth century.

N. Oh, I don't think so.

M. You think not.

N. No. I don't think it solves all the problems.

M. I mean you have your God. You have your trinity. You have Jung, Freud, Adler - that becomes your trinity.

N. Yeh, but a lot of people don't believe in them. And they have a different kind of religion.

M. This is the same problem that Christianity went through around - ah- . . .

N. It's all right, I'm not quibbling about it. It's quite all right to call them semi-Gods, let's say.

M. Have you read much of the works of Jung?

N. Well, of course, I had to - study...

M. You had - to - what?

N. I'm interested in a variety of different things that I read.

M. I see. Ah - m - too, I think the most fascinating work that Jung does is with dreams. Ah, and I wonder how you react to the dream - to his interpretation of dreams, to the whole concept of the collective unconscious - do you think this is valid?

N. I think - my opinion isn't worth very much...

M. Why not?

N. Simply because it is a very personal one. It - is a little bit too much interpretation of certain dreams in accordance with what he thought, as a system that he believed in, including symbolism, and you see a great deal more in dreams then from that standpoint than, perhaps, there is. But I'm not questioning it because I don't know. First place, I don't read much; second place, I'm interested in other people who have sometimes very nice things but usually you get a conglomeration of a lot of data that you cannot explain. Jung was interested in that and trying to explain it. And I'm not particularly interested in it because, I think, it is more important to live in one's ordinary life and to see what kind of thoughts you have. You see, in a dream you're a little bit away from being able to handle it. With your thoughts processes, perhaps, there's a possibility

of guiding them.

M. You resent this?

N. No. Not at all.

M. Do you think one should cultivate one's dreams?

N. I don't know. If one seems to like it, yes. You see I come back to that.

M. Right, you do.

N. But because I think it is a personal question entirely. If someone tells me, 'you ought to read Jung' and then I probably will when I respect the person that tells it to me. But when it's simply a matter of common sense or publicity or certain things that happen to be the vogue - that doesn't mean that I will do it.

M. No, but alright, let's - let's - do you - How do you react to the concept of the collective unconscious?

N. Oh, I think it is there.

M. You think it is there.

N. Oh, yes. I think there is a great deal unconscious.

M. Right, but is it a collective body common to all men?

N. No, I think it is quite individual.

M. So you don't believe in...

N. No. As collective. I think that certain exist, of course, which are similar in different people. To that extent, you might say, it is collective.

M. Umhum. What's the common bond of men then?

N. Well, in the first place that they have a body. Second, they have something they call their feelings, and the third place they have something that is their brain. And besides I think there is something that is quite essentially a person representing his life, and this a very difficult definition because, what is life in man and then that problem, does that kind of life continue to exist after he dies, or has it been in existence before he was born? I think it is very interesting to see if life is actually is an eternity or something of an eternal character which is temporarily put in a form which we now call a human being, and therefore if this human being has a body, happens to die does life continue

to exist and if so in what kind of form?

M. You ask it as a question.

N. You see, that is a question a person should and could ask and I think it is a question he will try to answer because he is interested, of course, in <sup>dying</sup> ~~dying~~. He has to prepare for it because it's going to come. The question is then: how will he meet his own death?

M. Well, I would say the American way which seems to be VERY valid to me is to ignore death as much as possible, so when it comes let it be a surprise so that so you don't have to stew about it.

N. Yeh, but people do stew about it. You see, does it help you to say 'don't'. If you happen to be constituted that way, that you worry, it doesn't help you very much to say, 'don't worry'. If it's a question between your feeling and your mind, very often there's a conflict between the two, that I would say don't do this and that, don't feel that way and I know that I continue to feel that way. I can bring out all kinds of reasons why I shouldn't feel it and still I continue to feel it. I think this is usually the difficulty for any kind of a man, that he doesn't know exactly what to do because his heart or his feeling tells him to do one thing and his mind tells him to do something else. Now I think if there were a way of alleviating that conflict it would give much more peace - peace of mind.

M. Do you think about dying very much?

N. No. I have.

M. You have resolved for yourself.

N. Yes.

M. There's no fear left in you.

N. None.

M. Why do you continue to live them. I mean if you...

N. Because I have something to do.

M. Why?

N. Why? Because I think that's an obligation.

M. What do you have to do?

N. What I'm doing at the present time.

M. Talking, visiting, seeing people?

N. Yes.

M Learning.

N. Yes, telling them what I think. What I have profited by so that they can use it.

Maybe. I think it is a good aim. The same as a doctor.

M. But you're ready to die.

N. Oh yes. Any time.

M. How long have you been prepared to die?

N. Oh, I think that comes gradual.

M. It does?

N. I think so.

M. Did you have this feeling when you were twenty-five, say?

N. Oh, I doubt it.

M. Only recently?

N. At twenty-five I never thought of this. Very seldom. That is, I had to because my father died, so I've had to face death in many different ways because I've seen people die, and I've been present to them when they did die and, of course, you start to think about it. You can't help it. But you usually want to postpone it because you're too much alive. That's a little morose at that time. At least it's considered morose. But I think that gradually one changes a little bit one's attitude towards it; the more and older you get the more you know that you have to face it and you will be to some extent up against it.

M. I think the most telling criticism of dying and death was written by Cam<sup>65</sup> in a play when he described the death of a child during the <sup>war</sup> ~~play~~ in Algeria, and the very death of the child in the hospital was enough to change the thinking of a Christian - of a Catholic Priest to where he could no longer accept a God. who would - who would carry a child through such agony.

M. My question is: Is it actually a God who does it? Again, you see, you have to solve that question for yourself as long as you believe in a personal God

who is going to mete out that particular kind of fate to a little child and that then, you might say, that the God kills the child. If one believes that, then naturally ~~she~~ will not accept it so easily. On the other hand, having to accept it as a fact you might question the <sup>existence</sup> of that kind of a God, and maybe have to change your concept of a God. I think we change it all the time dependent on the experiences we have.

M. You think maybe we should change our concept to sort of a - well, I've heard one of my philosophically oriented friends define God as a sort of a - ah - a trouble-making bumbler who at times <sup>causing</sup> ~~reigns~~ havoc almost by accident, and He'll look down and say, "Oh, gracious, what have I done? I've knocked off this whole city. Oh! Goodness Me!" I mean, that's a fairly appealing view of God because that means he's, you know, he's just a - he's human.

N. Yeh, It's kind of a way of bringing a God down to earth. I think the limitation is that in one's mind you cannot conceive of some <sup>thing</sup> else unless it is personified. I think that's the whole trouble, it's not that God has to be personified. Because, on the other hand, if you happen to think about questions of infinity or eternal or omnipresent or omniscient, omnipotent - what are those concepts? If those are attributes of a God - if I'm considering certain life force, should it always be in a form, or could one actually conceive of something that's eternally existing every where and always, even without form, and wouldn't that idea be closer to the <sup>existence</sup> of an all-seeing God: but again we say 'seeing' because we think He's a person, of course he isn't. Infinity never can be a person. You see, you have to change your concept of God. If I cannot conceive of it, I have to change my mind to get to the point where I could actually receive that kind of an impression, and if that is the limitation of man and he still has to admit that something exists as infinity, which would mean non-dimensional and not subject to time, then I cannot only conceive of it to the extent that I say it ought to exist, but I cannot experience it, and then I think the problem becomes, how can I change my mind so that I actually could experience that concept of God <sup>to</sup> and then you're back again <sup>to</sup> the religion, because then the aim of man is to become God, or at least have a contact. If you take the mysticism certainly you want,

you want contact with God, to be united with that what is the all-pervading father and endlessness or whatever it may be.

M. Have you existed before?

N. That's a very difficult question. If I ask people who seem to know, of course, they say 'yes'.

M. What I'm asking you; have you existed before?

N. Well, you bring up this ~~deja~~-vu. You know the question; do I know I have existed or have I experiences which are similar to that what I think I have had. The answer to that is, yes. And it is nothing unusual for my mind to assume that that actually occurs in the form of recurrence of a form of reincarnation. I think scientifically there is no objection to assume it to the extent one will say, 'do you know' as experience. I'm living this life. If I wish to experience former lives or lives hereafter I have to be completely impartial towards this life. You see what I mean?

M. No.

N. If I can get away from earth and look at earth from an objective standpoint, so that earth becomes a point for me; then it would be possible for me to see in this point the totality of all lives, including my own, and that would mean that the time line that now is history is reduced to one point. It's a question of impartiality and being far enough away from it, and still have the ability of perception. Then on that standpoint I can consider that all lives as being lived by me, and including everybody else, of course, exist at this present moment because I'm not subject to the time as I now experience on earth.

M. The interesting word you used there was 'impartiality'.

N. Yes.

M. Because if I'm to say that there's a theme to the answers you've given to my various questions, it is a search for impartiality.

N. That's right.

M. I then want to ask you if you really are - do you feel that you're truly - you're really striving to be impartial in all things. What about the small

irritating things of every day life?

N. The question is the impartiality - one first has to develop the possibility of becoming impartial. I call it objective because by that definition you simply <sup>imply</sup> that everything that is non-subjective would become objective, or everything I want to define I cannot define objectivity then only in the negation of subjectivity. But also I say that subjectivity belongs to this earth, so that every <sup>thing</sup> outside this earth ~~is~~ <sup>on</sup> the planetary level or solar level or a level of different constellations, or even what one would call 'absolute', certainly is a degree of increased impartiality regarding that where you came from. So it is a question then of freedom or loosen <sup>ing</sup> oneself from the bondage of earth, gradually evolving to the point where you are free. And one-hundred percent impartiality would mean one has that kind of total freedom.

M. Have you reached, have you reached that point yet?

N. I wouldn't say that, because again that is a personal question and one cannot say or talk about that. But we can indicate that that would be an aim, but if one could reach it I think the obligation is to be on earth and then to act or to live in accordance with the rules of impartiality so that again one participates in ordinary life, but this time from a <sup>conscious</sup> standpoint. Makes it quite different. And the reason for that is that one must assume as long as you're still on earth and living and breathing and no accident has happened to one and haven't died as yet, because the body has not as yet been ~~destroyed~~, and then there is still that obligation for a man to remain a man. So the real purpose of man on earth is to be able to become harmonious so that he actually could be free and is free and still perform all the duties that are required of him.